

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES  
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2001  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

Orders were filed in the following matters extending the time within which to grant or deny a petition for review to and including the date indicated, or until review is either granted or denied:

B122245/S100556 Ruth Kennedy v. Friskies Petcare Company – December 7, 2001.

E028237/S100650 In re Matthew K., a Person Coming Under the Juvenile Court Law; People v. Matthew K. - December 14, 2001

H021633/S100586 In re Carlos A. Perez on Habeas Corpus – December 7, 2001.

S032832 People, Respondent

v.

Omar Fuentes Martinez, Appellant

Due to the extraordinary circumstances cited by Deputy Attorney General Carlson M. Legrand in his application for extension of time to file respondent's brief, it is ordered that the time to serve and file respondent's brief is extended to and including January 2, 2002.

No further extensions of time will be granted.

S044693 People, Respondent

v.

Randall Clark Wall, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the appellant is granted to and including January 4, 2002, to request correction of the record on appeal. Counsel for appellant is ordered to serve a copy of the record correction motion on the Supreme Court upon its filing in the trial court.

No further extensions of time to file a motion to correct and complete the record are contemplated.

S044834 People, Respondent

v.

Raymond F. Johns, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including January 4, 2002.

S045078 People, Respondent

v.

Royal Clark, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including December 31, 2001.

S094710 People, Respondent

v.

Robert Neal Anderson, Appellant

On application of respondent (Attorney General) and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the brief on the merits is extended to and including November 13, 2001.

No further extensions will be granted.

S101764 Gregory Cocotis, Petitioner

v.

Contra Costa County Superior Court, Respondent  
People, Real Party in Interest

The above-entitled matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, for consideration in light of *Hagan v. Superior Court* (1962) 57 Cal.2d 767. In the event the Court of Appeal determines that this petition is substantially identical to a prior petition, the repetitious petition shall be denied.

S099547 In the Matter of the Suspension of Attorneys  
For Nonpayment of Dues

Due to clerical error on the part of the State Bar of California, and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the order of suspension for nonpayment of dues filed on August 17, 2001, effective September 1, 2001, be amended *nunc pro tunc* to strike the name of **Trischa Jo O'Hanlon, #96548**.

S100248      In re **Paris D. Brunner** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Paris D. Brunner, State Bar No. 139112**, be suspended from the practice of law for two years, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for two years on condition that he be actually suspended for one year and until he makes restitution to the Estate of Deena Hegardt, specifically to Timothy Perez (or the Client Security Fund, if appropriate) in the amount of \$3,000; to the Estate of Deena Hegardt, specifically to Lisa Poe (or the Client Security Fund, if appropriate) in the amount of \$3,000; and furnishes satisfactory proof thereof to the Probation Unit, State Bar Office of the Chief Trial Counsel. Respondent is further ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed on July 19, 2001. It is also ordered that respondent take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order or during the period of his actual suspension, whichever is longer. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) If respondent is actually suspended for two years or more, he shall remain actually suspended until he provides proof to the satisfaction of the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct. Respondent is further ordered to comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar and one-half of said costs shall be added to and become part of the membership fees for the years 2003 and 2004. (Business & Professions Code section 6086.10.)

\*(See Bus. and Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S100251      In re **C. R. “Bud” Marsh** on Discipline

It is ordered that **C. R. “Bud” Marsh, State Bar No. 79631**, be suspended from the practice of law for one year, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for three years subject to the conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed on July 17, 2001. It is further ordered that he take

and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar and one-fifth of said costs shall be added to and become part of the membership fees for the years 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006. (Business & Professions Code section 6086.10.)

S100283      In re **Anderson Lightfoot Jonas** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Anderson Lightfoot Jonas, State Bar No. 86193**, be suspended from the practice of law for six months, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for one year subject to the conditions of probation, including 90 days actual suspension, recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed on July 5, 2001. Credit toward the period of actual suspension shall be given for the period of interim suspension which commenced on April 10, 2001 (*In re Young* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 257, 270). It is also ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) It is further ordered that he comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of this order, unless he has already complied with this requirement as set forth in the order regarding interim suspension filed on March 7, 2001, by the Review Department of the State Bar Court.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7.

\*(See Bus. and Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S100284      In re **Jack Michael Pilson** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Jack Michael Pilson, State Bar No. 117487**, be suspended from the practice of law for 30 days, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for two years subject to the conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed on June 5, 2001. It is further ordered that he take

and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in equal installments for membership years 2002 and 2003.

S100287      In re **Jon D. Railsback** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Jon D. Railsback, State Bar No. 64853**, be suspended from the practice of law for six months, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for one year on condition that he be actually suspended for 30 days. Respondent is also ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed June 28, 2001. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar and one-half of said costs shall be added to and become part of the membership fees for the years 2002 and 2003. (Business & Professions Code section 6086.10.)

S100288      In re **William Wong Woo** on Discipline

It is hereby ordered that **William Wong Woo, State Bar No. 98489**, be disbarred from the practice of law and that his name be stricken from the roll of attorneys. Respondent is also ordered to comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and to perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the date this order is effective.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar.

\*(See Bus. and Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S100293      In re **Manuel Lopez** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Manuel Lopez, State Bar No. 40235**, be suspended from the practice of law for one year, that execution of the suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for two years subject to the conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed on July 18, 2001. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6140.7.